



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/591,857	05/24/2007	Hua Qiang	DEQ10337P00110US	4248
32116 7590 10/07/2008 WOOD, PHILLIPS, KATZ, CLARK & MORTIMER 500 W. MADISON STREET SUITE 3800 CHICAGO, IL 60661				
EXAMINER				
NGUYEN, PHUNG HOANG JOSEPH				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2614				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/07/2008		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/591,857

Applicant(s)

QIANG, HUA

Examiner

PHUNG-HOANG J. NGUYEN

Art Unit

2614

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 May 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4-6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SF/ICE)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date 9/5/06
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 1-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

3. Claim 1 claims "each invoking relationship involving a head node and a tail node which is used for calling the head node". It fails to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Is the invoking relationship involving a head node and a tail node called the head node? Or is the head node, an element of the invoking relation, called the head node? Appropriate correction/clarification is required.

4. Claims 2-6 are rejected because they are depending on rejected claim 1. Examiner notices that if appropriate correction/clarification to claim is made, it would heal the deficiencies of claims 2-6.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dugan (US Pat 6,807,711) in view of Tan et al (US Pub 2005/0172013).

As to claim 1, Dugan teaches a method for realizing Intelligent Network (IN) service (**fig. 3; the intelligent network includes a plurality of service nodes, col. 6, line 11**), comprising:

A. setting an IN service as a combination (**fig. 3: Network management system 212 controls a plurality of nodes 204**) of at least one service feature (**col. 8, line 57: applications within those nodes 204 to communicate with each other; col. 11, line 14: the NMS 212 accesses and controls the services and hardware through agent functionality within the IDNA nodes 204**), and each service feature corresponding to a node type (**fig. 3: IDNA node 204**).

B. selecting one or more service features from the combination, and configuring one or more invoking relationships (**col. 6, line 19: invocation at each service node**) of the selected one or more service features (**col. 16, line 56: invokes NOS's LRM 577 via the NOS client object 558 and the NOS name translator function 570 (FIG. 8(b)) to locate and select an instance of the called service**), corresponds to one service user number (**col. 28, line 57 – col. 29, line 13**).

C. upon receiving a service request from a user terminal (**par. 0003: such as call forwarding or voice mail can be invoked by subscriber; and par. 0109: SLEE is available to accept service requests**), determining the primary node based on the

service user number corresponding to the service request (*col. 28, line 57 – col. 29, line 13*);

Dugan does not explicitly teach each invoking relationship involving a head node and a tail node which is used for calling the head node, wherein a node that is always a tail node is a primary node and one primary node. Furthermore, neither does Dugan explicitly teach performing the selected one or more service feature respectively by each of the nodes corresponding to the selected one or more service features, beginning from the primary node and according to the order of the invoking relationships, to implement the IN service which the user terminal requests.

Tan in general teaches the operational rules provided by the primary node can be propagated in a hierarchical fashion throughout the grid to other nodes (Abstract). In a bit more detail, Tan teaches a request for service is received from the primary service node at the secondary service node. Service is provided to the primary service node responsive to determining that the request for service is associated with the primary service node, par. 0008 for the purpose of providing the details associated with how service requests are to be handled are propagated throughout the grid rather than explicitly defined at each of the service nodes. Therefore, the infrastructure required in the grid can be reduced as the operational rules can be automatically propagated upon registration of service nodes with other service nodes in the grid, par. 0004.

Therefore it would have been obvious to the ordinary skilled artisan at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Tan into the teaching of Dugan

for the purpose for effectuating the communication process in a utilizing and infrastructure-cost saving.

As to claim 3, Dugan, in view of Tan, teaches the invoking relationship involving two nodes is a relationship of direct or indirect unilateral call (**fig. 3 shows each service node 204 is interact with the other**).

7. Claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Dugan (US Pub 2006/0165223) in view of Tan et al (US Pub 2005/0172013) further in view of Clark (US Pat 6,560,326).

As to claim 2, Dugan, in view of Tan, teaches the service feature. Both Dugan and Tan do not explicitly teach one or more service features comprise any one or any combination of the features of: welcome message playing, language selection, originating calling number screening, routing, time-based routing, date-based routing, weekday-based routing, user-selection-based routing, proportional call distribution, routing based on a circular way, authority.

Clark teaches one or more service features comprise any one or any combination of the features of: welcome message playing (**Clark: Fig. 3 has the message service 48**), language selection, originating calling number screening (**Clark: 900 number screening, col. 1, line 47**), routing, time-based routing, date-based routing, weekday-based routing, user-selection-based routing, proportional call distribution, routing based on a circular way (**Clark: Fig. 1 shows a plurality of Signal control SCP 20, exchange SSP 14 and transfer 24. These are evident elements**

of routing methods) for the purpose of delivering the effective routing method in the communication (*fig. 4*).

Therefore it would have been obvious to the ordinary skilled artisan at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Clark into the teaching of Dugan, in view of Tan, for the purpose of clearly defining what type of service features a provider can provide to the subscriber. Furthermore it would be practical and cost saving to both provider and subscriber that the service features can be controlled and facilitated by the service combination manager.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claims 4-6 are objected to as allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

INQUIRY

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to PHUNG-HOANG J. NGUYEN whose telephone number is (571)270-1949. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday, 8:30AM - 5:00PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on 571 272 7499. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/CURTIS KUNTZ/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2614

/Phung-Hoang J Nguyen/
Examiner, Art Unit 2614